Remarks:

With regards to the last Office Action mailed 04/29/2005, Examiner has rejected claims 21-23, 26, 29-31 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien in view of Lamond. And, claims 24-25, 27-28, 32-33 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien in view of Lamond, and further in view of Smith et al. Applicant has herein canceled claims 21-28, and is respectfully asking Examiner to reconsider claims 29-36 pursuant to the telephonic discussion of 05/03/2005, and the remarks below.

Applicant wishes to point out that the present invention successfully solves a complex structural puzzle to substantially cover the twisted portion of a twisted wrench with a shroud that is externally formed substantially non-twisted. This is not as simple as it may seem. The present invention achieves perpendicularly opposed, elongated end openings (necessary to conform to the planar rotation of a twisted, flat wrench structure) without the external surfaces of the shroud being twisted or having planar rotation. In other words, the perpendicularly opposed end openings are connected by external surfaces that are substantially non-twisted. If one skilled in the art were to combine the teachings of both Hsien and Lamond, the combination would yield a shroud which may have an inner cavity configuration different than the outer configuration (as taught by Lamond), but the external configuration would still be twisted with the planar rotation as taught by Hsien. One could not rely upon Lamond's teachings because they are directed to **single-ended wrenches that are not structurally twisted.** In fact, Lamond does not in any way teach or address the structural complexities of a handle or shroud formed to cover a **double-ended wrench that is structurally twisted with planar rotation.** In addition, Lamond discloses a shroud which has opposed, elongated end openings

that are **aligned with each other** for application to a non-twisted, flat wrench structure. Accordingly, one must rely upon Hsien's teachings of twisting the shroud for application to double-ended wrenches, and therefore, Lamond's shroud would be logically twisted to achieve the perpendicularly opposed, elongated end openings necessary for a twisted, double-ended wrench. Therefore with regards to the above, applicant respectfully believes that it is inappropriate to suggest that the externally formed non-twisted handle of Lamond would remain non-twisted (when combined with the teachings of Hsien) if one were to apply Lamond's teachings to a twisted, double-ended wrench (which Lamond does not.) In summation, applicant believes beyond a doubt, that the complete structural configuration of the present invention **wrench and shroud combination as claimed** is not disclosed or rendered obvious by the combination of both Hsien and Lamond.

In view of the above, it is believed that claims 29-36 should be made allowable, and an expeditious allowance of the patent thereto is earnestly solicited. Applicant wishes to respectfully acknowledge and thank the Examiner for her assistance (and patience) via telephone on 05/03/2005 which has caused the applicant to respond in a way that is believed to have advanced this case.

Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 05/05/2005

Richard J. Macor
26 Alpaugh Drive
Asbury, NJ 08802-1213
Phone (908) 479-6011
FAX (908) 479-6645

Via Facsimile Only to
(703) 872-9306